

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable consideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-13 are presented for consideration. Claims 1, 9, 12 and 13 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 have been amended to clarify features of the subject invention. Support for these changes can be found in the original application, as filed. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the Office Action dated January 29, 2007. In that Office Action, claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,227,948 to Boon et al. in view of U.S. patent application publication number 2002/0121615 to Nakasuji, Korean patent publication number 2001-065114 to Ha et al. and U.S. patent application publication number 2005/0229690 to Kikuchi et al. Applicant submits that the cited art, whether taken individually or in combination, does not teach or suggest many features of Applicant's present invention, as previously recited in these claims. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 9, 12 and 13, for example, as presented, amplify the distinctions between the present invention and the cited art.

In particular, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of the Boon et al., the Nakasuji publication, the Ha et al. publication and the Kikuchi et al. publication does not teach or suggest salient features of Applicant's present invention, as recited in the independent claims. Specifically, Applicant submits that the rejection appears to be based on impermissible hindsight in that Boon et al. does not recognize any problem of magnetic flux. Thus, there would be no reason for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's inventions to look to

Nakasuji for the solution to such a problem. Further, the Nakasuji document is directed to detecting magnetic flux in a different apparatus structure, specifically, that of lenses 5 and 13, rather than anything roughly equating to a sliding member, as in the present invention recited in the independent claims. Applicant submits, therefore, that nothing in the Nakasuji document would suggest to provide a magnetic flux detection means and demagnetizing means in a moving member and a sliding member, as in the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Notwithstanding, Applicant has further defined, in independent claims 1, 9, 12 and 13, that a plurality of magnetic-flux detections means is provided on the guided moving member for detecting magnetic flux along the lines of the target during movement of the moving member along the length of the sliding member. Applicant submits that even if the combination of Boon et al., Nakasuji, Ha et al., and Kikuchi et al. were to suggest providing magnetic-flux detection means, nowhere do those citations teach or suggest the use of a plurality of detection members, nor would there be any apparent reason for the inclusion of multiple magnetic-flux detection members based solely on the teachings within the cited art.


For the reasons noted above, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of art does not teach or suggest salient features of Applicant's present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 9, 12 and 13. Applicant submits, therefore, that the present invention, as recited in those independent claims, is patentably defined over the cited art, whether that art is taken individually or in combination.

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-8, 10 and 11 also should be deemed allowable in their own right for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Further individual consideration of these dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the instant application is in condition allowance. Applicant requests favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early notice of allowance.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Steven E. Warner
Registration No. 33,326

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SEW/EAB

FCHS_WS 1430692_1.DOC